



ZFW

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In Re Application of: ARACEL FERNANDEZ-DECASTRO

Art Unit: 3743

Appln. No. 10/659,325

Examiner: Aaron J. LEWIS

Date Filed: September 11, 2003

Washington, D.C.

For: FACE MASK

Atty.'s Docket: DECASTRO=10

Date: December 22, 2005

Confirmation No. 3767

THE COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Customer Service Window
Randolph Building, Mail Stop Amendment
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

Sir,

Transmitted herewith is a [XX] INTERVIEW SUMMARY in the above-identified application.

[] Small Entity Status: Applicant(s) claim small entity status. See 37 C.F.R. §1.27.

[XX] No additional fee is required.

[] The fee has been calculated as shown below:

	(Col. 1)		(Col. 2)	(Col. 3)
	CLAIMS REMAINING AFTER AMENDMENT		HIGHEST NO. PREVIOUSLY PAID FOR	PRESENT EXTRA EQUALS
TOTAL	* 9	MINUS	** 20	0
INDEP.	* 1	MINUS	*** 3	0
FIRST PRESENTATION OF MULTIPLE DEP. CLAIM				

SMALL ENTITY	
RATE	ADDITIONAL FEE
x 25	\$
x 100	\$
+ 180	\$
ADDITIONAL FEE TOTAL	
\$	

OTHER THAN SMALL ENTITY	
RATE	ADDITIONAL FEE
x 50	\$
x 200	\$
+ 360	\$
TOTAL	
\$	

OR

OR

- * If the entry in Col. 1 is less than the entry in Col. 2, write "0" in Col. 3.
- ** If the "Highest Number Previously Paid for" IN THIS SPACE is less than 20, write "20" in this space.
- *** If the "Highest Number Previously Paid for" IN THIS SPACE is less than 3, write "3" in this space.

The "Highest Number Previously Paid For" (total or independent) is the highest number found from the equivalent box in Col. 1 of a prior amendment of the number of claims originally filed.

[XX] Conditional Petition for Extension of Time

If any extension of time for a response is required, applicant requests that this be considered a petition therefor.

[] It is hereby petitioned for an extension of time in accordance with 37 CFR 1.136(a). The appropriate fee required by 37 CFR 1.17 is calculated as shown below:

Small Entity

Response Filed Within

- [] First - \$ 60.00
- [] Second - \$ 225.00
- [] Third - \$ 510.00
- [] Fourth - \$ 795.00

Month After Time Period Set

Other Than Small Entity

Response Filed Within

- [] First - \$ 120.00
- [] Second - \$ 450.00
- [] Third - \$ 1020.00
- [] Fourth - \$ 1590.00

Month After Time Period Set

[] Less fees (\$) already paid for month(s) extension of time on

[] Please charge my Deposit Account No. 02-4035 in the amount of \$.

[] Credit Card Payment Form, PTO-2038, is attached, authorizing payment in the amount of \$.


[] A check in the amount of \$ is attached (check no.).

[XX] The Commissioner is hereby authorized and requested to charge any additional fees which may be required in connection with this application or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-4035. This authorization and request is not limited to payment of all fees associated with this communication, including any Extension of Time fee, not covered by check or specific authorization, but is also intended to include all fees for the presentation of extra claims under 37 CFR §1.16 and all patent processing fees under 37 CFR §1.17 throughout the prosecution of the case. This blanket authorization does not include patent issue fees under 37 CFR §1.18.

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.

Attorneys for Applicant(s)

Facsimile: (202) 737-3528
Telephone: (202) 628-5197

By: 
Anne M. Korbau
Registration No. 25,884



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

ATTY.'S DOCKET: DECASTRO10

In re Application of:)	Art Unit: 3743
)	
Aurora L. Fernandez-Decastro)	Examiner: Aaron J. Lewis
)	
Appln. No.: 10/659,325)	Washington, D.C.
)	
Filed: September 11, 2003)	Confirmation No. 3767
)	
For: MULTIPURPOSE MASK)	December 22, 2005
)	

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Honorable Commissioner for Patents
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Customer Service Window, Mail Stop Amendment
Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

Sir:

The following is a summary of the interview conducted December 14, 2005, between Examiner Lewis and the undersigned.

Applicant's attorney wishes to thank Examiner Lewis for the courtesies extended during the telephone interview of December 14, 2005.

During that interview, claims 19 and 21-28 were discussed. The primary reference cited in the Office Action of November 15, 2005, was Begum, U. S. Patent No. 6,758,215. In the amendment filed November 19, 2004, applicant submitted a declaration under 37 CFR 1.131 demonstrating that she had

invented the mask which is the subject of the present application prior to October 17, 2002, the filing date of Begum. Because of this declaration, Examiner Lewis agreed that Begum was no longer a valid reference, and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Begum and De Saint Rapt had been overcome.

Accordingly, Examiner Lewis said that no further response to the Office Action of November 15, 2005, was necessary, and that he would issue a Notice of Allowance in due course.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant

By: 

Anne M. Kornbau
Registration No. 25,884

AMK:srd

Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197

Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528

G:\BN\D\Deca\DeCastro 10\Pto\Interview Summary 22 Dec 05.doc